

## **REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action mailed 04/18/2007, and further in view of the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) submitted herewith. Previously pending claims 1- 29 are hereby cancelled and claims 30-44 have been newly added. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of this response. This response should obviate outstanding issues and make the pending claims allowable. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of this response.

## **STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Previously pending claims 1- 29 are hereby cancelled.

Claims 30-44 have been added via the current amendment submitted with the RCE.

## **OVERVIEW OF THE INVENTION**

The present invention, in one embodiment, provides for a computer-based method for validating a fragment of a structured document, wherein the computer-based method comprises steps of: (a) receiving as input a fragment of an XML document into a runtime validation engine; and (b) outputting a validation pass message as follows: (i) obtaining a first token from said fragment of said XML document, (ii) determining whether said first token is of element type said fragment of said XML document that is to be validated against, and if so, (iii) obtaining next token from said fragment of said XML document, (iv) checking whether said next token signifies end of said fragment of said XML document, and if so, returning a validation pass if an annotated automaton encoding (AAE) stack is empty; and, if said next token does not signify end of said fragment of said XML document, continuing validation as in validating an entire XML

document, and when successfully validated as in an entire XML document, returning to step iii until end of said fragment of said XML document token is received, wherein, when first token is not of said element type, or when said continued validation as in validating an entire document fails in step iv or when said AAE stack is not empty, said method returns a validation failure message.

### **COMMENTS REGARDING PREVIOUSLY CITED FRANZ REFERENCE**

Applicants present here a brief discussion with respect to previously cited reference to Franz et al. titled “An Efficient Schema Typing System”, hereafter Franz. Applicants wish to respectfully note on the record that the newly added claims 30-44 cannot be anticipated or rendered obvious by the previously cited Franz et al. reference.

For example, although Franz provides for a XML Schema Typing System that is based on finite state automata, it should be specifically noted that Franz fails to teach or suggest at least the feature of outputting a validation pass message based on:

- **obtaining a first token from said fragment of said XML document**
- determining whether said first token is of element type said fragment of said XML document that is to be validated against, and if so, **obtaining next token from said fragment of said XML document**,
- **checking whether said next token signifies end of said fragment of said XML document, and if so, returning a validation pass if an annotated automaton encoding (AAE) stack is empty,**

- if said next token does not signify end of said fragment of said XML document, continuing validation as in validating an entire XML document, and when successfully validated as in an entire XML document,  
**iteratively implementing the method until end of the fragment of said XML document token is received,**
- **when first token is not of said element type, or when said continued validation as in validating an entire document fails in step iv or when said AAE stack is not empty, returning a validation failure message.**

If the examiner still feels that such are disclosed in a cited reference, Applicants respectfully remind the examiner that it is the duty of the examiner to **specifically point out** each and every limitation of a claim being rejected as per §1.104(c)(2) of Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations and section 707 of the M.P.E.P., which explicitly states that “the particular part relied on must be designated” and “the pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified”.

**SUMMARY**

As has been detailed above, none of the references, cited or applied, provide for the specific claimed details of Applicants' presently claimed invention, nor renders them obvious. It is believed that this case is in condition for allowance and reconsideration thereof and early issuance is respectfully requested.

This response is being filed with a request for extension of time. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the extension fee, as well as any deficiencies in the fees provided to Deposit Account No. 50-4098.

If it is felt that an interview would expedite prosecution of this application, please do not hesitate to contact Applicants' representative at the below number.

Respectfully submitted,

*/ramraj soundararajan/*

Ramraj Soundararajan  
Registration No. 53832

4821 A Eisenhower Ave  
Alexandria, Virginia 22304  
(703) 461-7060 x111

October 18, 2007